

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11 and 13-16 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found in Applicants' specification on page 7, lines 17-22, for example. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Tamai in the November 18, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8-12.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 5 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/00507052 to Katsuzawa et al. (hereinafter "Katsuzawa") in view of Japanese Publication No. 06-1214962 to Takao. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites "a motor winding of a stator including a coil and a lead wire, said lead wire and said coil being affected by varnish treatment such that said lead wire and said coil are hardened by permeation of varnish, and said lead wire is used for externally connecting said coil of said stator with said external wiring."

The Office Action, on page 2, admits that Katsuzawa does not disclose a motor winding being subjected to varnish treatment.

As discussed with Examiner Tamai at the personal interview, the Office Action, on page 3, equates previous independent claim 1's lead wire to Takao's cable line 4, which is subjected to varnish treatment. However, as admitted in the Office Action, on page 3, Takao also discloses a method where varnish is prevented from permeating through the cable line 4 even when the varnish treatment is carried out. (*see* Takao's paragraph [0019]) In other

words, even when Takao's varnish treatment is applied, the varnish does not permeate through cable line 4. Thus, Takao's cable line 4 (the lead wire) is not hardened by permeation of varnish, which is contradictory to what is claimed in amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.


The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katsuzawa in view of Takao as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,132,584 to Sasamoto et al. (hereinafter "Sasamoto"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Sasamoto fails to overcome the deficiencies of Katsuzawa and Takao as mentioned above, with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, at least in view of the patentably distinct features of independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein, the rejections of claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 should be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/kcp

Date: November 26, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461